

## REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's withdrawal of the previous rejection. Applicants request reconsideration of the current claim rejections based on the above amendments and following remarks.

### Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-24 and 26-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,243,755 to Takagi, et al. At the very least, claims 1, 9, 17 and 26 are patentably distinct and patentable over Takagi.

For instance, with respect to claim 1, Takagi does not disclose *a universal messaging system coupled to the predictor, wherein the universal messaging system provides message services to the user based on predictions by the predictor of current or future locations, activities or needs of a user*, as recited in claim 1. In fact, on page 5 of the Office Action, it is acknowledged that Takagi does not explicitly teach a universal messaging system coupled to a predictor. The patentability (obviousness) of claim 1 based on the combination of Takagi and Donoho will be addressed below.

Further, with respect to claims 9, 17 and 26, Takagi does not disclose a system and method in which, e.g., a location database is used to store resource information about network services, application services, devices, hardware resources and software resources that are available at one or more locations for transferring information to the user in accordance with the user's schedule, wherein the resource information and event and time information of the user's schedule is used for predicting a location of the user and additional resources needed by the user at the predicted location, as essentially claimed in claims 9, 17 and 26.

Indeed, Takagi discloses a system which predicts necessary information that will be required by a user when using a mobile terminal (10) at a future time and location in order to

transfer such information to the user's mobile terminal (10) via a network and, thus, make such information available at the time and location (see, e.g., Abstract, Col. 8, lines 49-65). Takagi addresses the problem of limited resources/capacities of mobile terminals by providing a method for temporarily storing only that information (in the limited memory space of the mobile terminal) which is needed by the user of the mobile terminal at any given moment (see, e.g., Col. 1, lines 15-32; Col. 3, lines 27-34; and Col 38, lines 8-24).

The Takagi system is limited to use of, and information transfer to, a user's mobile terminal. In this regard, Takagi does not disclose or suggest a location database that maintains *resource information about network services, application services, devices, hardware resources and software resources that are available at one or more locations for transferring information to the user in accordance with the user's schedule*, as essentially recited in claims 9, 17 and 26. At most, Takagi discloses a network environment information providing unit (52) that provides network environment information (e.g., network type, bandwidth, etc.) to a requesting terminal, wherein the network information corresponds to network availability at specified location and time at which the mobile terminal (10) may connect to an available network to receive the necessary information (see, e.g., Col. 11, lines 1-27; and Col 38, lines 8-24).

For at least the above reasons, Takagi does not anticipate claims 1, 9, 17 and 26. In addition, all claims that depend from claim 1, 9, 17 and 26 are not anticipated by Takagi at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, 9, 17 and 26. Accordingly, withdrawal of the anticipation rejections is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8, 16, 25 and 34 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Takagi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,362 to Donoho. Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice and thus, the specific rejection is moot. Claims 16, 25 and 25 are patentable over the combination of Takagi

and Donoho at least by virtue of their dependence from respective base claims 9, 17 and 26, and for the reasons set forth above. Indeed, Donoho does not cure the deficiencies of Takagi as noted above with respect to claims 9, 17 and 26. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is requested.

Claim 1 was amended to include subject matter similar to that of canceled claim 8. However, claim 1 is believed to be patentable and non-obvious over the combination of Takagi and Donoho. Indeed, at the very least, such combination does not disclose or suggest *a universal messaging system coupled to the predictor, wherein the universal messaging system provides message services to the user based on predictions by the predictor of current or future locations, activities or needs of a user*, as recited in claim 1. In the first instance, it is acknowledged that Takagi does not disclose a universal messaging system.

Furthermore, Donoho discloses (in Col. 7, line 21 – Col. 8, line 9 and Col. 12, lines 1-67) a system for generating and distributing technical support advisories to target users (computer consumers) for various technical problems. Although Donoho generally discloses messaging, the messaging system of Donoho is different in scope and purpose of the claimed inventions in that Donoho does not disclose messaging service based on *predictions of current or future locations or activities of the user*. In combination, the Donoho and Takagi do not disclose the invention of claim 1, as a whole.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa  
Reg. No. 43,584  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL.: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889